Lillian & Harold Weisberg

Coq d'Or Press ROUTE 8, FREDERICK, MD. 21701

Code 301 / 473-8186

2/17/70

Mr. James J. Rowley, Director
U.S. Secret Service
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Rowley,

I am exhausted with the inexcusable and unnecessary delays various agencies of the government find it possible to place in the path of my investigation of the assassination of President Kennedy in its investigation. Believing there has been adequate time for response to the simple request of my letter of two weeks ago, I will tell you further about this and other matters already the subject of correspondence between us. Believing it is in the interest of both of us, I take the liberty of obtaining this you obtain and read for yourself a small government document titled "Attorney General's Memorandum on the Public Information Section of the Administrative Procedure Act". It was issued by the Department of Justice in 1967. One need not be a lawyer to understand most of it, especially the accompanying statements by the President and the Attorney General.

On several occasions I referred to this law, invariably without response from you. This law does relate to you and your agency. While the last thing I want to do is involve it in court as it relates to the Secret Service, as I have on a number of occasions indicated, if really becomes necessary, I will. Because I believe the Secret Service was not responsible for the President's assassination and because a full airing of such a matter in court would be embarrassing employees and executives of the Secret Service would never forget, I would like to avoid what I believe will be hurt to them, their reputations and their families. What I am really asking of you is that you do not force this upon me as the only remaining course of action. I am asking that you do what it requires of you, with an end to deceptions, misrepresentations and the asserted evasions and stallings that have characterized your responses (and failures to respond) to the proper inquiries I have made.

Hoping, if you are not familiar with it, that it will facilitate your understanding that the law does relate to you and without equivocation, I here enclose a photocopy of the top of page 24 of the cited memorandum. On it I have marked two consecutive sentences. In this connection, I believe the agency of "paramount" interest with regard to the evidence I have asked of you is the Secret Service. In each case, you obtained it. If my belief is wrong, you are then required to consult with whatever agency you believe has this paramount interest. If there is such an agency in possession of that which I seek from you, it is thereafter required to regard the request addressed to you as addressed to it. In no single case has this ever happened. Furthermore, you are supposed to "avoid encumbering" my "path with procedural obstacles".

On the other hand, I have offered you access to some of the information I have developed. This is a demonstration of my willingness to trust you, despite the unfortunately clear record of this correspondence. It is also acknowledgement of my belief that your agency has paramount interest in the protection of the President and within reason [illegible] to this end only.

I am not sure previous to the receipt of our correspondence, and I do hope you will have this done, to the end that there be a proper response to every proper question I have asked of you and request if have made of you. If you find any improper, I would welcome you specifying it. Here I go back only to last summer, a relatively brief interval. So we can better understand each other and you can understand my use of some of the foregoing language, I begin with two quotations from your letter of August 25, 1968:

"...the Secret Service had no information pertaining to the assassination of President Kennedy which was not furnished to the Commission and its staff."

"The Secret Service has no information, reports or evidence pertaining to the assassination of President Kennedy which was not turned over to the National Archives as directed by the Attorney General".

Neither of these is a correct statement. If you dispute this, as I am confident you will not, I will copy and send you the Secret Service proof.

My most recent request, dated February 4 and really a renewal of an earlier request, illustrates this. You have and should still have certain still pictures, the number of which is recorded in investigative reports in my possession. All of these were not given to the Commission. I have asked to see them. Is there any legal or proper reason for refusing this request? Why, then, the delay that in itself is contrary to the law and its spirit? To make this easier for you and to save time, I have offered to travel to your office for this purpose.

On January 27 I asked for access to the documents of various kinds, the records relating to the original obtaining of this film. In this letter I also renewed my frequent requests for answers to the unanswered questions and for access to the withheld evidence that cannot properly be withheld and is.

In my three preceding letters, dated December 9 and 7 and November 24, 1969, I had also repeated these same requests. The December 7 letter also protested the meaninglessness of the Secret Service letter of November 24. The November 24 letter asked what was done with the receipts for the autopsy evidence. Here I repeat what seems like a rather transparent device for evasion, Mr. Kelley signing for Protective Research and saying what I seek is not in <u>those</u> files. My requests have never been of any one part of your agency but have been addressed to the agency, the things I seek must exist or where there must be records of what disposition was made of anyx of them. If they are not in PR files, that is irrelevant and immaterial. Nor I further note inadequate or unmade response to my inquiries about the receipt by the FBI for a "missile" removed from the President's body. This could have been what the Panel Report described as an "unidentified structure" in the brainx or a 6.5mm bullet fragment in the back of the head. And I ask for all records of each of these things, or origin ls if you have them, copies if you do not, pictures if they were made, and disposition made of the objects themselves. You will recall that all your agents left the hospital they took everything with them.

My August 6 letter asked for response to that of earlier date, points on which there had been no meaningful response, protests misrepresentation about the death certificate and the alteration of the substitute misrepresented as this death certificate. As we both know, you had what I asked for. You had also written me August 6 that you "find no copy of the most mortem authorization", presumably, from the manner of signing, in PR files only. I renew my request for this, not in PR files but in any Secret Files, with the copy to be made from the original or, if that is not possible, from the best copy you have from the records of disposition of the origi-

and any [illegible] all relating papers or records of any kind.

My letters of July 31 and 14 [illegible] in which I asked for what is required if I am to comply with the requirements of the regulations in invoking the Freedom of Information Act. As I have said, I'd prefer not to have to do this. But you will not comply with that request, which seems pretty contemptuous of the law and the expressed will and intent of Congress. Here I also requested a copy of the so-called "Memorandum of Transfer" cited in the Panel Report, of the Secret Service copy, not that given the Kennedy estate. Referring me to the Archives on this, knowing they would say the copy they have is part of the estate, is a shabby device at best. So, I renew my request for the Secret Service copy and any and all relevant records. I have sent you the proof your interest here is the "paramount" interest, which is controlling.

As we both know, this record, extending over a period of about a half year, is not unusual. It is entirely consistent with the total record. I hope it will not become necessary for me to reconstruct the entire record in this manner, thus reducing it to immediately-available and quite comprehensible form, to remain in government files and mine, or to wind up as a record in an archive in a major university or as a summary in my own writing.

If any of this presents any problems of which I may not be cognizant, or if for any other reason you want to discuss this with me, you need only tell me. In closing, I remind you I have not forgotten my offer to send you a list of what you have made available to sycophantic writers and deny me. Again, I hope it will not be necessary to make such a record.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

impo[illegible] [illegible]ation to [illegible] or procure a [illegible] in response to a request [illegible] by the fact that the term "information" in the [illegible] introduced, [illegible] changed by the Senate to "identifiable records" [illegible] by the legislative history of that change. (S. Rept., 39th Cong., [illegible])

Most [illegible] will probably be directed to records which are the exclusive concern of the agency of which the request is made. Where a record requested which is of concern to more than one agency, the request should be referred to the agency whose interest in the record is paramount, and that agency should make the decision to disclose or withhold after consultation with the other interested agencies. Where a record requested from an agency is the exclusive concern of another agency, the request should be referred to that other agency. Every effort should be made to avoid encumbering the applicant's path with procedural obstacles when these essentially internal Government problems arise. Agencies generally should treat a referred request as if it had been filed at the outset with the agency to which the matter is ultimately referred.